

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 4-6, and 10-15 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added.

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

The Examiner rejected claims 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Accordingly, applicant has amended claims 10-14 to direct to a computer-readable storage medium as suggested in the Office Action. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment has overcome the rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Aronson et al (U.S. 6,654,787 B1). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 as amended sets forth:

generating one or more signatures using a *length* of the electronic communication and the URLs extracted.

(Claim 1 as amended) (emphasis added)

In contrast, Aronson fails to disclose at least the above limitation. According to Aronson, a filter module RS(B) 730 may filter spam based on a mathematical signature (e.g., a checksum) (Aronson, col. 5, ln. 54-55). However, Aronson does not disclose generating the signature using a length of the electronic communication and the URLs extracted. Therefore, Aronson fails to anticipate claim 1 as amended. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) has been overcome.

Claims 10 and 15 are not anticipated by Aronson for at least a similar reason as the one discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 2-9, 11-14, and 16-20 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 10, and 15, respectively, and thus, include the limitations set forth in their respective base claims. For the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1, Aronson does not anticipate claims 2-9, 11-14, and 16-20.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the remarks and the amendments.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a)(3), applicant hereby requests and authorizes the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 1/18, 2008

By: 
Chui-kiu Teresa Wong
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 48,042

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300